Peer Coaching for Technology Integration

Competitive Technology Grants Providing Professional Development for High Need School Districts

Funded by the ESEA Title II, Part D-Enhancing Education Through Technology

July 1, 2010- September 30, 2011

Request for Proposals (RFP)

Denise Juneau, Superintendent

Montana Office of Public Instruction

PO Box 202501

Helena, MT 59620-2501

www.opi.mt.gov

Peer Coaching for Technology Integration (PCTI)

Abstract

The goals of the Peer Coaching for Technology Integration Grant funds are to: improve student academic achievement through the effective use of technology in teaching and learning, improve technology literacy of teachers and students, and improve the capacity of teachers to effectively and efficiently integrate technology into their curriculum and instruction. This proposal process will serve to create strong regional technology partnerships between local Montana school districts, mentor partners, and a Montana Regional Educational Service provider in order to provide professional development to prepare peer coaching teams in high need school systems across Montana. Peer coaching teams will assist teachers in their school system to effectively integrate technology across the curriculum to improve teaching and learning. The partnerships will form the basis of a strong relationship to provide professional development and support that will strengthen the intellectual and practical knowledge base, increase networking, and increase the impact of grant funds across Montana.

Table of Contents

Peer Coaching for Technology Integration

_____

Request for Proposals
For Competitive Grants SY 2010-11

_____

Funded by:
Enhancing Education Through Technology (Ed Tech)
Title II, Part D of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act
as Amended by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001

Timeline	
June 29, 2010	RFP Application posted on the Office of Public Instruction (OPI) Web site and announcements sent to eligible Local Education Agencies (LEAs)
June 29, 2010	RSA Directors meeting – Presentation and Question and Answer Session
August 16, 2010	Applications postmarked by this date or received by the OPI by 5:00 p.m. Applications sent by mail should be sent by certified mail.
September 6, 2010	Application review process, awards and project negotiations completed
March 1, 2011	Mid Year Implementation Report Due
September 30, 2011	Last date to obligate funds
November 10, 2011	Final Fiscal and Program Implementation Report Due

General Application Information

Who do we contact at the Office of Public Instruction for assistance?

Michael Hall
Telephone: (406) 444-4422
E-mail: mhall@mt.gov

Applications postmarked no later than August 16, 2010, should be sent by certified mail. Applicants are encouraged to submit their proposals earlier if possible.

Send the original application and four (4) copies to:

Michael Hall
Office of Public Instruction
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501

ESEA Title II, Part D, Ed Tech Program Goals

1) To improve student academic achievement through the effective use of technology in teaching and learning,
2) To improve the technology literacy of teachers and students, and
3) To improve the capacity of teachers to effectively and efficiently integrate technology into their curriculum and instruction.

Peer Coaching for Technology Integration Grant Objective Outcomes

1) One hundred percent of identified peer coaches will complete the entire professional development program preparing them to be peer coaches in their school system by June 30, 2011.
2) One hundred percent of identified peer coaches in each participating district will be proficient in technology basic skills, as measured by a score of 90 percent or better, on the SimpleAssessment Post-Assessment: Student Technology Proficiency (NETS-S 1998) for Windows.
3) Ninety percent of 8th grade students in each participating district will be proficient in technology basic skills, as measured by a score of 90 percent or better, on the SimpleAssessment POST-ASSESSMENT: Student Technology Proficiency (NETS-S 1998) for Windows by June 30, 2011.
4) Peer Coaches will successfully assist other teachers to move technology use/integration from lower-level, teacher driven technology use to a level of use that transforms the teaching and learning environment as measured by observations, interviews and teacher and mentor reflection blogs by June 30, 2011.
5) Student technology use will move from low-level, teacher driven technology use to a level of use that transforms the learning environment as measured by to-be-determined measurement tools by June 30, 2011.
6) One hundred percent of participating peer coaches will be proficient on Montana Content Standards and Essential Learning Expectations (ELE) for Technology and Information Literacy/Library Media, as measured by a score of 90 percent or better, on the Montana Content Standards Proficiency Assessment.

7)   One hundred percent of participating school systems will have successfully completed their technology plan review/revision process by June 30, 2011 as measured by the peer review comments and revisions on their plans.

Peer Coaching for Technology Integration Grant Description

Peer Coaching is designed to help schools implement a professional development model that enhances standards-based instruction by assisting teachers to offer students engaging, technology rich, learning activities. The peer coaching model will professionally develop teacher leaders (teacher librarian and classroom teacher pairs) to serve as peer coaches for their colleagues. As coaches, these teachers will assist their peers in identifying ways that technology can strengthen classroom curriculum and enhance their students' academic achievement. Further, they will help their colleagues to develop the necessary technology skills and instructional strategies needed to integrate technology into teaching and learning.
Paraphrased from: http://www.psctlt.org/tl/peer_coaching_program.html

The Peer-Ed project from the Ed Lab Group in Seattle, Washington, will provide the professional development in the Microsoft Peer Coaching Program. Eight professional development sessions will be provided to all participating team members.
Reference: http://peer-ed.com/default.aspx

The eight sessions will be delivered in blended learning environments including face-to-face sessions, digital synchronous and asynchronous approaches with a mix of release days and a weekend day. Approximately 56 hours of professional development will be provided through the grant year. Applicant districts are encouraged to work with their RSA partners to provide OPI Renewal Units as desired.

Tentative Schedule:
Sessions 1 and 2 are scheduled for face-to-face on September 17-18th (offered East/West or in Helena –TBD)
Sessions 3 and 5 are scheduled for October 21-22 in Helena
Session 4 is expected to be delivered on-line
Sessions 6-8 are not scheduled at this time (East/West delivery is anticipated)

Applicants will budget for the cost of the professional development package (detailed later), related travel expenses and substitute teacher fees or stipends as appropriate.

Teachers will identify the Following Traits in a Successful Peer Coach:
- Is able to build trust with peers
- Builds on what a teacher needs
- Is a team player
- Communicates well and listens to teachers
- Knows what teachers are doing in their classrooms
- Can show teachers how to replace what they are doing with something better, not just present technology as an add-on
- Is highly organized and plans well in advance with teachers
- Provides a safe, risk-taking environment and is non-threatening, non-judgmental, and accepting
- Is flexible
- Has enough depth and breadth of knowledge to help teachers who are at various stages of technology integration, including knowledge of appropriate instructional strategies
- Knows how to organize and structure a technology-rich classroom
- Is recognized by staff as a strong/outstanding teacher

Potential Coach Roles

Coaches assist teachers to develop the skills and strategies needed for classroom use of technology by:

- planning technology-rich activities or projects with individual teachers.
- identifying resources or strategies necessary for successful learning activities.
- modeling or team-teaching lessons that integrate technology and engaging learning strategies.
- reflecting or debriefing on learning activities.

Adapted from: Peer Coaching Program, Appendix D, Microsoft Peer Coaching Program

Peer Coaching for Technology Integration Grant Implementation

The grant process will focus on the development of key regional partnerships between a host LEA, additional high need LEAs, a Regional Service Agency (RSA), and the OPI. These partnerships will serve to meet the objectives of the grant funds.

An LEA will serve as the host for the grant in their region. The LEA will work in conjunction with the Regional Service Agency (RSA) for their region who will direct the grant on behalf of the LEA. The RSA for each region (see map below for region boundaries) will work in conjunction with the host LEA and will direct the grant on behalf of the lead LEA. Each RSA is responsible for providing quality professional development and other grant services to participating districts across their region.

As appropriate, other districts in the region that are not identified as high need may purchase the services from the partnership to expand the outreach of the grant and funding. Information on the RSAs can be located on the OPI Web page at: http://www.opi.mt.gov/TitleIIPartA/TitleIIPartAStateL.html.

See Appendix B for the Eligibility Spreadsheet.

Technology Purchases

At a minimum, the participating coach's school system will receive a laptop, document camera and flip video camera (projected at this time) for each coach. Further, each participating school system will receive a technology budget to purchase technology to assist those teachers who have been coached.

Technology Plans and Children's Internet Protection Act

Technology plans are required at the individual LEA level under the current legislation for the ESEA Title II, Part D program and will be utilized for these grants. As such, technology plans are required to be current and include all required elements. The required elements can be found on the OPI Web site at www.opi.mt.gov/EdTEch/Index.html under the "Technology Planning" tab. This Web page has the program-specific language as well as the Montana Integrated Technology Framework which incorporates the requirements of both the ESEA Title II, Part D program and the E-Rate program. LEA's are encouraged to use the integrated framework.

1) During the grant operation, with the assistance of the regional technologist and/or other consultants identified through NEW SLATE schools or in the region, participating districts, will revise their technology plans through June 30, 2011.

2) A peer review process will be undertaken whereby district plans are peer reviewed by educators from other districts participating in the Peer Coaching for Technology Integration grants statewide. If weaknesses are noted, they must be addressed by the LEA immediately upon receiving the review comments. The peer review process is expected to be completed by August 30, 2011.

Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA)

Districts must certify compliance via one of the following three avenues:
1) District receives E-Rate funding and/or ESEA Title II, Part D funding and has certified CIPA compliance to those programs, **or**
2) District does not participate in the E-Rate program or the ESEA Title II, Part D program, however, hereby certifies that it is CIPA compliant, **or**
3) District does not participate in the E-Rate program and/or the ESEA Title II, Part D program and the CIPA requirements do not apply because no funds are used to purchase computers used to access the Internet, or to pay the direct costs associated with accessing the Internet.

NOTE: Districts have certified CIPA compliance through signing the Common Assurances for Federal Programs in the Consolidated Application for Federal Funds in summer/fall 2010 and will renew that certification when completing the application for 2011-2012.

Eligible Applicant Districts

The NCLB legislation specifies that only LEA's eligible for the ESEA Title II, Part D program with the highest number or percentages of children from families with incomes below the poverty line **and** are identified for improvement or corrective action under the ESEA Title I regulations **or** have a substantial need for technology and have not "redirected the use of the ESEA Title II, Part D funds" under the authority of ESEA Title VI –Rural Education Achievement Program, are eligible to apply. Potentially eligible districts that have "REAP Flexed or Transferred" their Ed Tech funds under the authority of ESEA Title VI, may apply for the competitive funds under this program by changing the status of those funds in the Consolidated Application for Federal Funds as long as the funds have not been moved to the ESEA Title I program area (the Schoolwide program is acceptable).   For questions about these provisions, contact Michael Hall at (406) 444-4422.

Districts may apply/participate in only one proposal. Consult the district eligibility spreadsheet for district specific information in Appendix B (separate document.)
Eligible applicant districts are identified by "YES" in column 9 of the district eligibility spreadsheet.

NOTE: Many other districts will qualify as "Eligible Applicant Districts" that are not currently indicated as such on the eligibility spreadsheet. Potentially eligible districts are listed in column nine of the eligibility spreadsheet as "undetermined." In order to make a final determination, Authorized Representatives from interested school systems must submit a letter to the OPI Title II, Part D office prior to the August 16, 2010, grant submission date documenting the school systems:

- SimpleAssessment scores for their district staff (if available),

- Relevant technology proficiency data (if available),

- Details on their technology professional development for the 2009-2010 school year,

- Proficiency data from the 8th grade student technology literacy scores from the 2009-2010 school year (all districts participating in the Title II, Part D program with 8th grade students have this data),
- Observations about the peer-to-peer/collaboration that currently is taking place in their school system.

Based upon the data, the OPI will determine the technology need.

Equitable Participation of Private/Nonpublic School Students and Personnel-Requirements for the HOST School System

The equitable participation requirements in the ESEA Title IX, Part E, Subpart 1 apply to these grants.

LEAs and eligible local entities must engage in timely and meaningful consultation with appropriate private school (including home schools) officials during the design and development of programs and continue the consultation throughout the implementation of these programs. This consultation must take place before the LEA makes any decision that affects the opportunities of eligible private school students, teachers, and other educational personnel to participate in the program. Therefore, consultation must begin during the development of the local Phase II grant proposals.

LEAs and local entities must provide, on an equitable basis, special educational services or other benefits that address the needs under the program of children, teachers, and other educational personnel in private schools in areas served by the LEAs and local entities. The services and programs provided by the LEA do not have to be identical to those offered to public school students and teachers.

Expenditures for educational services and other benefits for private school children, teachers, and other educational personnel must be equal, taking into account the number and educational needs of the children to be served, relative to the expenditures for participating public school children.

At all times the LEA remains in control of the funds, maintains title to all equipment and materials purchased with such funds, and makes the final decisions.

Follow local district policies for consultation with private schools in their districts.

Note: Attach documentation of the private/nonpublic school consultation to the proposal upon submission. If the private schools have already said "No" to participation in the Title II, Part D funding for the school year, they do not need to be contacted again; contact only those who indicated that they were interested.

See Appendix A for a list of nonpublic schools that have indicated an interest in participating in ESEA Title II, Part D programs. If any of are listed and are in your participating district(s), follow the ESEA Title IX requirements.

Topics for inclusion in the consultation may include:

Section 9501(c) (1) of the ESEA requires that LEAs or eligible local entities consult with appropriate private school officials on such issues as:
- how the children's needs will be identified;
- what services will be offered;
- how, where, and by whom the services will be provided;
- how the services will be assessed and how the results of the assessment will be used to improve those services;

- the size and scope of the equitable services to be provided to the eligible private school children, teachers, and other educational personnel and the amount of funds available for those services; and
- how and when the agency, consortium, or entity will make decisions about the delivery of services, including a thorough consideration and analysis of the views of the private school officials on the provision of contract services through potential third-party provider.

Partnerships

Regional School Districts (required)

Each application submitted by a prime applicant (lead eligible applicant participating school system) must, at a minimum, include five partners. The partnership must include the prime applicant, at least three other eligible applicant school systems (other than an elementary or high school district associated with the prime applicant district), mentor(s) and at least one Regional Education Service Agency (RSA) provider. The purpose of the partnerships is to assist the high-poverty/high-need districts to improve teacher and student technology literacy and effectively integrate technology to improve student academic achievement. *Participating districts should represent a regional coverage (not just a section of the region if possible).*

Awarded grant projects are encouraged to offer services to other districts in the region that do not meet the "high need" criteria and are not eligible for services through grant funds. Interested districts are encouraged to use their Ed Tech formula funds and/or local funds to purchase the service from the partnership network.

In partnership with the prime applicant district, responsibility for administering the grant will be carried out by the participating RSA. Please note, *m*ore *than one grant can be submitted from a region as long as the RSA from the corresponding region is involved.*

Higher Education Schools of Education (recommended/optional)

Establishing a relationship between pre-service and in-service teacher education programs will provide a valuable link between K-12 schools and higher education faculty as each unit strives to meet teacher preparation standards and student content standards. Interactions between the teacher education program faculty member(s) and the leaders of the regional grant and the teacher participants may take many forms. In the grant proposal, detail the interactions and the intended benefits and outcomes for the partners.

Regional Service Agencies (required)

Montana Regional Service Agencies (RSA) are developing through funding and guidance from the OPI to improve student achievement in Montana schools by providing state support and funding for high-quality professional development. Contact the providers in your area by utilizing the information listed below (see map below to determine the regional service agency in your area). Information on the RSAs can be located on the OPI Web page under the Montana Professional Development Partnership (MPDP) at: http://www.opi.mt.gov/Programs/TitlePrgms/TItle_II_X/Index.html?gpm=1_2

Contact Information for Montana's Regional Service Areas

WM-CSPD–Western Montana – Comprehensive System of Personnel Development

Nancy Marks, WM-CSPD Coordinator
215 S. 6th Street West
Missoula, MT 59801
Web Site: www.wmcspd.org

(406) 728-2400 Ext 1061
E-mail: admin@cspd.net
Fiscal Agent: Missoula County Public Schools

MNCESR – Montana North Central Educational Services Region

Gaye Genereux, Director
17555 Coal Mine Road
Big Sandy, MT 594334
Web Site: www.mncesr.org

(406) 378-3136
E-mail: gayegenereux@yahoo.com
Fiscal Agent: Havre Public Schools

MRESA3 – Montana Regional Educational Service Area 3

Marsha Sampson, Director
College of Education
1500 University Drive
Billings, Mt 59101
Web Site: **www.msubillings.edu\smart**

(406) 657-2085
E-mail: MSampson@msubillings.edu
Fiscal Agent: MSU-Billings

PESA – Prairie Educational Service Area

Karen Pickart, Director
Box 701
Glendive, MT 59330
Web Site: www.mt-pesa.org

(406) 377-6489
E-mail: pickart@midrivers.com
Fiscal Agent: Glendive Public Schools

RESA4U – Regional Education Service Area 4 You

Rene Holubec, Director
55 S. Rodney Street
Helena, MT 59601
Web Site: www.resa4u.org

(406) 437-3110
E-mail: rholubec@helena.k12.mt.us
Fiscal Agent: Helena Public Schools

Montana's Regional Service Areas (RSA) and Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Regions (CSPD I-V)

WM - CSPD – Western Montana – Comprehensive System of Personnel Development

MNCESR – Montana North Central Educational Services Region

MRESA3 – Montana Regional Educational Service Area 3

PESA – Prairie Educational Service Area

RESA4U – Regional Education Service Area 4 You

OPI Contacts:

Kelly Glass, kglass@mt.gov, **(406) 444-0716**
Susan Bailey-Anderson, sbailey-anderson@mt.gov, **(406) 444-2046**

Proposal Development and Implementation

1. Professional development provided through Ed Tech funds is required to be ongoing, sustained, intensive, job embedded and high quality. The grants establish a priority for professional development. Professional development expenses that constitute at least 50 percent of the awarded grant funds will receive professional development bonus points in the competition.
2. Professional Development expenses include the cost of the peer coaching professional development, related travel expenses, substitute teacher fees for professional development attendance and for release time set-aside (if desired) for the peer coaches to work with other teachers as well as stipends for participants working beyond the contracted period (summer, weekends, nights, etc.) if desired.

Project Evaluation: Data Collection and Reporting.

Successful grantees will work with the evaluators from Education Northwest in order to assess the effectiveness of the peer coaching professional development model being implemented at a regional and local level. Assistance with the collection and reporting of evaluation data from the professional development events, peer coaching, instructional coaching and observations within the scope of the project will be provided.

Evaluation instrumentation will, at a minimum, include:
1) SimpleAssessment from InfoSource (Teacher Technology Skill Assessment taken by peer coaches pre and post – coaches will be given access to instructional libraries through InfoSource learning to advance and support their personal technology skills).
2) Professional Development assessments as defined by the OPI and implemented through the RSAs.
3) Other assessments as determined locally or by the evaluators.

Participating School Systems Leadership Meetings (budget for these meetings if they are face to face)

The RSAs, along with leader administrator(s) from the participant school systems, must maintain ongoing communication. At a minimum, monthly contact must be established (technology mediated/face to face, personal calls or conference calls). Notes from the contact must be kept and a copy provided to the OPI and the Education Northwest evaluator(s). This information provides the OPI and the evaluators with pertinent information for the ongoing implementation and evaluation of the program.

Technology Resources

At a minimum, each participating coach will have available a laptop computer, document camera and flip video camera. Equipment purchased is the property of the host district for the duration of the active grant award period; at the end of the grant the equipment is intended to become the property of the district where the technology was placed during the active period of the grant. Grant proposals are encouraged to look at the OPI Web site for information on discount purchases for Montana Schools located at www.opi.mt.gov/discounts/Index.html and at organizations such as the Organization for Educational Technology and Curriculum at www.oetc.org .

Each participating school system will receive $4,000 to provide resources in the system for teachers to utilize as they work with the resident peer coaches.

Technology Plan Revision/Peer Review Process

Technology plan reading and scoring will be done by teams of peers from partner school districts participating in the Peer Coaching for Technology Integration grants. The Montana Integrated Technology Plan Framework will serve as the basis for the plan revisions. The framework self assessment and assessment rubric will be utilized in the revision and review process. These documents can be located on the OPI Web site at http://www.opi.mt.gov/EdTech/Index.html under the technology planning tab. District technology plans will be revised through June 30, 2011, and the peer review process will be completed by August 30, 2011.

Each grant proposal will develop and implement their process for achieving the technology plan development and peer review (budget for the implementation of this requirement for the participating school systems in this region).

Technology Showcases and Technology Conferences – Regional and State Wide

Successful grantees are encouraged to participate in a regional showcase in spring 2011 to provide opportunities for teachers in the region to benefit from the experiences of the grant participants. The RSAs may be offering a regional showcase through their NEW SLATE grant project. If not, participants are encouraged to participate in a regional showcase elsewhere in the state. These professional opportunities will provide presentation skills and confidence in the presenters and encourage them to further share their peer coaching and technology integration skills. Proposals must budget for travel and related expenses.

Peer Coaching for Technology Integration regional grantees will participate in an annual technology conference/showcase, scheduled each summer in cooperation with the NEW SLATE grants, in order to showcase innovative technology use and peer coaching happening within their region. Each grantee will be responsible for providing at least three different presentations at the annual conference. Grantees must budget for travel and related costs for the conference tentatively scheduled for Great Falls in June 2011, however, subject to change based upon the outcome of the special project detailed below.

Peer Coaching for Technology Integration Joint Projects State-wide Showcase Special Project

Grant writers are encouraged to submit an additional request for up to $10,000 to support the development and implementation of a Showcase/Technology Conference designed to bring together the participants of the other funded grants. The purpose of the event is to increase the network of partnerships and to share knowledge gained throughout the grant operation.

One proposal will be accepted from among the successful grant applicants. The proposal narrative may be up to two pages in length plus one page for a detailed budget (not counted in the maximum pages allowed for the grant proposal) and must detail how the funds will be spent to accomplish the purposes. Funds may be used to secure meeting space, Internet connectivity, pay speakers' fees (keynote speaker/presenter is an option) and stipends and other regularly expected costs of producing a conference event. Participation by educators outside the peer coaching grants is encouraged and may be charged a fee to attend. Such fees are expected to be utilized to support the implementation of the showcase.

Budget and Fixed Costs

Funding is available for an anticipated five grants. The grants are expected to range from $100,000 (-) $150,000 for the School year 2010-11. Proposals will apply for funding to implement the required four teams and any additional teams desired in their region. Included in the budget must be the fixed costs associated with the implementation of the core model in the region applying along with travel, substitute teacher fees, equipment and stipend expenses. The table below represents the fixed costs associated with the grants. Each response to this RFP will be responsible for addressing the following items in addition to the implementation costs for facilitation of the grant, technology, travel, substitute teacher fees, stipends, cost for representative attendance at the statewide showcase, etc.

Peer Coaching for Technology Integration Grants	
Fixed Costs Per Grant	Total/Site (minimum based upon 4 Teams)
External Evaluation (Per regional grant-not dependent on number of teams)	$12,200
Peer Coaching Professional Development per person ($1,400 x 8)	$11,200
Technology for Participating School Systems Minimum: 4 school systems x $4,000	$16,000
Total of Fixed Costs	$39,400

Note: An indirect rate may only be assessed by the prime applicant (host) district. Districts must have applied for, and received the indirect rate in order to build it into their budgets. Indirect rates must be applied for each year. Thus, for the purposes of this application, the indirect rate must be the approved rate for the 2010-2011 School year. For information on indirect rates, contact Paul Taylor at the OPI (406) 444-1257.

Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan

The Montana Board of Public Education established the goal that all school districts develop, implement, evaluate, and revise a single Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan (5YCEP) to ensure continuous education improvement for all students and all schools. The ultimate goal is for a single comprehensive education plan that meets local needs and the needs of all state and federal programs, with specific program amendments as necessary.

While not a required element of the 5YCEP, the district technology plan should be thought of as a supporting section that details how technology supports the district's goals for student achievement.

Districts have completed the required revision of their 5YCEP original plans. To the extent possible, demonstrate, in a table, listing the district name, the Technology Plan goals, and the connections to the 5YCEP goals for the participating districts.   When the technology plan revision process is completed, participating school systems are expected to include the 5YCEP information in the local plans.

Grant Review Process

The application review process for the grant narrative will consist of: (1) a review by a panel of educators experienced in reading similar grant proposals who will score the applications; (2) peer review among grant applicants, and (3) a review by an OPI team that will make necessary policy decisions regarding the awards. The technology plan review process will be done by teams of peers from partner school districts participating in the grants as previously described.

Minimum Grant Score
Grants recommended for funding must score 70 percent or greater in the competition. Grants accepted for funding may require program and budget revisions before final approval and funding is released.

Ed Tech Formula Grants
As required by the enabling NCLB statute, high-poverty districts (Census data) that are awarded a formula grant allocation less than the average of the allocations received by high-poverty districts in the state must be given a priority in the competition. Identified districts will receive one bonus point in the competition (see attached Eligibility Spreadsheet for district specific information). The bonus points of all districts involved in a proposal will be added to the final proposal review score.

Related Pertinent Information

How much funding is available for the grants?
Congress has approved an estimated $610,277 for Montana for the implementation of these grants.

How many grants can be funded?
It is anticipated that five partnership grants will be funded (one per region). It is anticipated that the grants will range from $100,000 (-) $150,000. Final budgeted items and amounts will be negotiated with recipients.

Can the applications be submitted electronically?
No. Original signatures are required on the application (host district and each participating district) and electronic messaging may fail; thus, no electronic submissions can be accepted (e.g., **no** facsimiles, e-mails, disks or flash drives).

Is there a minimum or maximum number of districts that need to be involved?
Yes, at a minimum one host school system and three other participating school systems must be included in the proposal.

Signature Page - Copy this page as needed for additional signatures-One page per district is acceptable.

<table>
<tr>
<td>
Montana
Office of Public Instruction
Denise Juneau, State Superintendent
opi.mt.gov
</td>
<td>
Peer Coaching for Technology Integration Grants
Enhancing Education Through Technology
ESEA Title II, Part D
Competitive Fund Application Signature Page
School Year 2010-2011
</td>
</tr>
</table>

Due Date
Postmarked No Later Than: August 16, 2010
Send by certified mail. Return an original of the application plus four (4) copies of the application to:
    Michael Hall, Specialist
    Office of Public Instruction
    PO Box 202501
    Helena, MT 59620-2501

OPI USE

District Name_____

County Name_____ LE_____

Page Length_____ Postmark_____

Format Requirements_____

Original signatures are required on the application and electronic messaging may fail, thus, No electronic submissions will be accepted (e.g. NO facsimiles, e-mails, or disks).

Program Goal
The primary goal of the Ed Tech program is to **improve student academic achievement** through the use of the technology in elementary and secondary schools. It is also designed to assist every student-regardless of race, ethnicity, income, geographical location, or disability-in becoming **technologically literate by the end of eighth grade**, and to encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with professional development and curriculum development to **promote research-based instructional methods** that can be widely replicated. Source: Guidance on the Enhancing Education Through Technology (Ed Tec) Program, U.S. Department of Education, March 11, 2002.

Signature Information
The Board of Trustees submitted a Common Assurances form to the Office of Public Instruction for the 2010-2011 school years, and no circumstances affecting the validity of the assurances have changed since its submittal. Further, the Board of Trustees has certified that the Common Assurances for Federal Programs and Specific Program Assurances for those programs in which this district/agency participates are accepted as the basic conditions for local participation and assistance in the operation of projects under this title.

	OPI USE
Prime Applicant District _____ Signature of Authorized Representative_____	☐ Eligibility Verified
	OPI USE
Partner Applicant District _____ Signature of Authorized Representative_____	☐ Eligibility Verified
	OPI USE
Partner Applicant District _____ Signature of Authorized Representative_____	☐ Eligibility Verified
	OPI USE
Partner Applicant District _____ Signature of Authorized Representative_____	☐ Eligibility Verified
	OPI USE
Partner Applicant District _____ Signature of Authorized Representative_____	☐ Eligibility Verified
	OPI USE
Partner Applicant District _____ Signature of Authorized Representative_____	☐ Eligibility Verified
	OPI USE
Partner Applicant District _____ Signature of Authorized Representative_____	☐ Eligibility Verified

Peer Coaching for Technology Integration Grants ~ SY 2010-11   **For each section below include a descriptive narrative that addresses the details**   **of the grant component previously detailed in this Request for Proposal document.**

Project Abstract: Summarize the grant proposal (Not Scored)
In one page or less, articulate a summary of the work that will occur within your region as your partnership implements the grant.
Partnerships – (15 points possible)
List the regional partners and explain how they will work together to achieve the grant objectives.
Key Personnel: (6 points possible)
List the key personnel and their responsibilities within the project (RSA director, regional facilitator if one is utilized, Regional Technologist, etc.).   • *include vitae or resum'e as attachments*   *After detailing the required information in the narrative for this section, write a concluding paragraph, noting the grant objective(s) addressed.*
Project Evaluation – (9 points possible)
Describe how your team will work together with the evaluator(s) to support the collection of relevant data in order to measure growth within your grant activities.   *Describe any assessment/evaluation tools that will be implemented in the grant (beyond those specified in the grant RFP).*   *After detailing the required information in the narrative for this section, write a concluding paragraph, noting the grant objective(s) addressed.*
Technology Plan Revisions (6 points possible)

Describe the process you will follow in order to assist participating districts with the revision of technology plans in order to meet the June 30, 2011 deadline for completion and the August 30, 2011 deadline for peer review.
     • *Support for local districts*
     • *Peer reviewers from participating districts*
 After detailing the required information in the narrative for this section, write a concluding paragraph, noting the grant objective(s) addressed.

Budget: (9 points possible with optional 15 points bonus for >50% Professional Development focus)
• *To receive the bonus points, a minimum of 50 percent of the total grant funds must be allocated toward professional development,*   • *Evaluation Costs (see fixed costs table above) and include any additional evaluation costs built into the regional proposal,*   • *An indirect cost rate may only be taken by the prime applicant (host) district and,*   • *No funds received through this grant program may supplant local funds.*   *Note: Districts awarded ESEA Title II, Part D formula grant funds through the consolidated application for federal funds have signed a statement of assurances certifying that funds received under this part will supplement, not supplant, state and local funds.*   *After detailing the required information in the narrative for this section, write a concluding paragraph, noting the grant objective(s) addressed.*
Alignment to Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan (6 points possible)
Describe the how the alignment of the 5YCEP for all partner districts to the district technology plans will occur.   *After detailing the required information in the narrative for this section, write a concluding paragraph, noting the grant objective(s) addressed.*
Nonpublic School Participation Consultation (6 points possible)
Include documentation on the process for nonpublic school participation consultation and the individual results for the participating districts.   *After detailing the required information in the narrative for this section, write a concluding paragraph, noting the grant objective(s) addressed.*
Project Objectives (15 points possible)
Describe how your proposal will meet the project objectives.   • *Provide clear and concise details on how your project will help participants meet project objectives (see page 6)*

Format requirements of the grant

- use half inch or larger margins,
- use Times New Roman, 12-point type,
- use double spacing and
- include no more than 30 lines of type per page.
- Maximum of 10 pages for the narrative responses (does not include appendices). Three additional pages are optional for the Technology Showcase/Conference activity.

Applications that do not meet format requirements will not be read or rated.

Peer Coaching for Technology Integration Grants ~ SY 2010-11
ESEA Title II, Part D – Enhancing Education Through Technology
APPLICATION EVALUATION RUBRIC

OPI USE: LE:_____ CO:_____ District Name_____Review Code: _____

Minimum Checklist			Criteria Not Met	Criteria Met
All districts meet high-need status as indicated by OPI spreadsheet				
All districts have signed off on Application Signature page of application and potential host schools system has submitted a letter of support				
Application meets formatting requirements				

ITEM	0	1	2	3
Proposal Abstract	Not Scored	Not Scored	Not Scored	Not Scored
Partnerships 15 points possible (3 X a weight of 5)	Proposal does not have partnerships beyond the lead LEA.	Proposal includes partnerships beyond the lead LEA, however, the minimum number of three additional school systems has not been reached	Proposal includes a minimum of one lead LEA and three other school systems and an RSA; however, the partnership does not represent a cross-section of the region.	Proposal includes a minimum of one lead LEA, four other high-need school systems and an RSA that represents a cross-section of the region.
Key Personnel (RSA staff, district staff, facilitator, et al.) 6 points possible (3 X a weight of 2)	Key personnel are not identified.	Key personnel are identified; however, the proposal is not clear on how each member will serve to meet the objectives of the grant.	Key personnel are identified and roles within the grant are assigned in order to meet the objectives of the grant.	Key personnel and individual roles are identified specifically detailing the impact on the effective implementation of the objectives of the grant. RSA Director and regional facilitator (if included) qualifications indicate strong capacity and willingness to assist the proposal in achieving the proposed objectives.
Evaluation 9 points possible (3 X a weight of 3)	Proposal does not include how evaluation will be supported.	Support for evaluation is addressed; however, it is not clear how grantees will work collaboratively.	Support for evaluation is addressed and a plan for how the grantees will support the effort to collect relevant data is outlined.	Support for evaluation is addressed and a detailed plan for how the grantees will support the effort to collect relevant data is outlined.
Technology Plan Revisions 6 points possible (3 X a weight of 2)	No reference is made to technology plan review process.	Technology plan review process is referenced but no clear plan exists for conducting the revision and peer review.	Technology plan review process is included and a plan for the revision and peer review process is outlined. Review process details how the district(s) demonstrate that they meet the CIPA requirements.	The technology plan review process is included with detailed strategies and activities and timeline for implementation is included. Review process details how the district(s) demonstrate that they meet the CIPA requirements.

Budget 9 points possible (3 X a weight of 3, optional 15 point bonus for > 50% professional development)	Budget is not included	Budget is included but does not support the objectives of the grant.	Budget for the grant operation with fixed costs incorporated is included and expenses support the objectives of the grant.	Detailed budget for the grant operation with fixed costs incorporated is included along with the descriptive summary of expenses and how they will be used to support the objectives of the grant. A minimum of 50% of the grant funds are allocated to professional development. (15 Bonus Points)
Alignment: Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan, ESEA Title II, Part D Technology Plans 6 points possible (3X a weight of 2)	Proposal does not include information on how the Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan and ESEA Title II, Part D technology plan will be aligned.	Proposal makes references to the Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plans, and the ESEA Title II, Part D technology plan but does not address how the plan will be aligned.	Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan, and the ESEA Title II, Part D technology plan are referenced with details on how the plans will be aligned.	Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan, and the ESEA Title II, Part D technology plan are referenced with specific details illustrating the alignment and supporting relationship developed through the implementation of the proposal.
Nonpublic School Participation Consultation Documentation 6 points possible (3X a weight of 2)	Proposal does not include information on the nonpublic school participation consultation documentation.	Proposal includes general information on the nonpublic school participation consultation.	Proposal includes information on the nonpublic school participation consultation for each of the participating districts or documents that no nonpublic schools will be participating.	Proposal includes detailed information on the nonpublic school participation consultation for each of the participating districts or documents that there are no nonpublic schools participating.
Project Objectives Reference Objectives on page 6. 15 points possible (3 X a weight of 5)	Proposal is not clear on how the project will meet the project objectives.	Proposal includes general information that does not provide clear details on how the project will meet the project objectives.	Proposal includes information that provides clear details on how the project will meet the project objectives.	Proposal includes detailed information that provides clear and concise details on how the project will meet the project objectives.
Professional Development Bonus (3 X a weight of 5) 15 bonus points possible	Proposal budget does not include a minimum of 50% of the total funds for professional development.			Proposal budget includes a minimum of 50% of the total funds for professional development.

Page Left Blank Intentionally

APPENDIX A

NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS PARTICIPATION

State Fy	CO #	County Name	LE #	LE Name	School Name	Org Type	Federal Program
2010	02	Big Horn	0021	Pryor Elem	St Charles Mission School	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	02	Big Horn	0023	Hardin Elem	Pretty Eagle Cthlc Schl	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	03	Blaine	1213	Hays-Lodge Pole K-12 Schls	St Paul Mission School	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	07	Cascade	0098	Great Falls Elem	Foothills Community Christian	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	07	Cascade	0098	Great Falls Elem	Heerema Home School	HOME SCHOOL	Title II Part D
2010	07	Cascade	0098	Great Falls Elem	Holy Spirit Catholic School	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	07	Cascade	0098	Great Falls Elem	Our Lady of Lourdes Schl	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	07	Cascade	0098	Great Falls Elem	Treasure State Academy	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	07	Cascade	0099	Great Falls H S	Great Falls Cen Cath High Schl	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	09	Custer	0244	Miles City Elem	Sacred Heart Elem	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	13	Fallon	0244	Baker K-12 Schools	Standard Home School	HOME SCHOOL	Title II Part D
2010	13	Fallon	0244	Baker K-12 Schools	Thibault Home School	HOME SCHOOL	Title II Part D
2010	15	Flathead	0310	Kalispell Elem	Kalispell Montesorri	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	15	Flathead	0310	Kalispell Elem	St Matthew School	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	15-	Flathead	0310	Kalispell Elem	Stillwater Christian Elem	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	15	Flathead	0310	Kalispell Elem	Trinity Lutheran School	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	15	Flathead	0334	Whitefish Elem	Whitefish Christian Academy	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	16	Gallatin	0350	Bozeman Elem	Great Beginnings School	PRIVATE	Title II Part D

State Fy	CO #	County Name	LE #	LE Name	School Name	Org Type	Federal Program
2010	16	Gallatin	0350	Bozeman Elem	Headwaters Academy	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	16	Gallatin	0350	Bozeman Elem	Heritage Chrstn Schl	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	16	Gallatin	0350	Bozeman Elem	Learning Circle Montessori EL	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	16	Gallatin	0350	Bozeman Elem	Learning Circle Montessori Sch	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	16	Gallatin	1239	Ophir K-12	Rogers Home School	HOME SCHOOL	Title II Part D
2010	21	Hill	0428	Havre H S	Beaverlodge Home School	HOME SCHOOL	Title II Part D
2010	24	Lake	0474	Arlee Elem	Nkwusm Salish Language School	HOME SCHOOL	Title II Part D
2010	24	Lake	1199	Ronan Elem	Barber Home School	HOME SCHOOL	Title II Part D
2010	32	Missoula	0583	Missoula Elem	Missoula International School	HOMESCHOOL	Title II Part D
2010	32	Missoula	0583	Missoula Elem	St Joseph School	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	32	Missoula	0583	Missoula Elem	Sussex School	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	32	Missoula	0584	Missoula H S	Loyola-Sacred Heart HS	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	34	Park	0612	Livingston Elem	Montessori Island School	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	34	Park	0612	Livingston Elem	St Mary's School	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	34	Park	1215	Arrowhead Elem	Thomas More School	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	41	Ravalli	0731	Corvallis K-12 Schools	Fawns Home School	HOME SCHOOL	Title II Part D
2010	41	Ravalli	0731	Corvallis K-12 Schools	Shupert Home School	HOME SCHOOL	Title II Part D
2010	41	Ravalli	0735	Hamilton K-12 Schools	Hamilton Christian	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	43	Roosevelt	0775	Poplar Elem	Round Face Home School	HOME SCHOOL	Title II Part D
2010	44	Rosebud	1230	Lame Deer H S	St Labre Indian High Schl	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	47	Silver Bow	0840	Butte Elem	Butte Central Elem School	PRIVATE	Title II Part D

State Fy	CO #	County Name	LE #	LE Name	School Name	Org Type	Federal Program
2010	47	Silver Bow	1212	Butte H S	Butte Central High School	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	53	Valley	0927	Frazer Elem	Johnston Home School	HOME SCHOOL	Title II Part D
2010	56	Yellowstone	0965	Billings Elem	Billings Educational Academy	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	56	Yellowstone	0965	Billings Elem	St Francis Intermediate	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	56	Yellowstone	0965	Billings Elem	St Francis Primary K-2	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	56	Yellowstone	0965	Billings Elem	St Francis Upper 6-8	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	56	Yellowstone	0965	Billings Elem	Trinity Lutheran School	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	56	Yellowstone	0966	Billings H S	Blgs Central Catholic H S	PRIVATE	Title II Part D
2010	56	Yellowstone	0983	Huntley Project K-12 Schools	Stott Home School	HOME SCHOOL	Title II Part D

APPENDIX B

Eligibility Spreadsheet

Separate Document

APPENDIX C

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION

Professional Development Evaluation
Adapted from Guskey, Thomas R. *Evaluating Professional Development*
Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc, 2000

EVALUATION LEVEL	QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED	MEASURE	WHAT IS MEASURED?	HOW WILL INFORMATION BE USED?
1 PARTICIPANTS' REACTIONS	• Did they like it? • Was their time well-spent? • Did the material make sense? • Will it be useful? • Was the leader knowledgeable and helpful? • Were the refreshments fresh and tasty? • Was the room the right temperature?	• Questionnaires or surveys administered at the end of the session	• Initial satisfaction with the experience	• To improve professional development program design and delivery
2 PARTICIPANTS' LEARNING	• Did participants acquire the intended knowledge and skills?	• Paper-and-pencil instruments • Simulations • Demonstrations. • Participant reflections (oral and/or written). • Participant portfolios	• New knowledge and skills of participants	• To improve instructional practice • ***To demonstrate the impact of professional development***
3 ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT AND CHANGE	• Were sufficient resources made available? • Were problems addressed quickly and efficiently? • Was implementation advocated, facilitated, and supported?	• Minutes from follow-up meetings • Questionnaires • Structured interviews with participants and district or school administrators	• The organization's advocacy, support, accommodation facilitation, and recognition	• **To document and improve organizational support** • To inform future change efforts

	• Were successes recognized and shared? • Was the support public and overt? • What was the impact on the organization? • Did it affect organizational climate and procedures?	• District and school records • Participant portfolios		
4 PARTICIPANTS' USE OF NEW KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS	• Did participants effectively apply the new knowledge and skills?	• Questionnaires • Structured interviews with participants and their supervisors • Participant reflections (oral and/or written) • Participant portfolios • Direct observations • Video or audiotapes	• Degree and quality of implementation.	• To document and improve the implementation of program content • *To demonstrate the impact of professional development*
5 STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES	• What was the impact on the students? • Did it affect student performance or achievement? • Did it influence student's physical or emotional well-being? • Are students more confident as learners? • Is Student Attendance improving? • Are dropouts decreasing?	• Student records • School records • Questionnaires • Structured interviews with students, parents, teachers, and/or administrators • Participant portfolios	• Student learning outcomes • Cognitive (performance and achievement) • Affective (attitudes and dispositions) • Psychomotor (skills and behaviors)	• To focus and improve all aspects of program design, implementation, and follow-up • *To demonstrate the overall impact of professional development*